



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/011,857	11/05/2001	Debendra Das Sharma	10017812 - 1	5264

22879	7590	09/21/2009
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY		
Intellectual Property Administration		
3404 E. Harmony Road		
Mail Stop 35		
FORT COLLINS, CO 80528		

EXAMINER
DANG, KHANH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2111	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
09/21/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

JERRY.SHORMA@HP.COM
ipa.mail@hp.com
jessica.l.fusek@hp.com



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
P.O. Box 1450
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
3404 E. Harmony Road
Mail Stop 35
Fort Collins, CO 80528

In re Application of: Debendra Das
SHARMA
Application No. 10/011,857
Attorney Docket No. 10017812-1
Filed: November 05, 2001
For: METHOD AND SYSTEM FOR
CONTROLLING FLOW OF ORDERED,
PIPELINED TRANSACTIONS BETWEEN
INTERCOMMUNICATING ELECTRONIC
DEVICES

SUA SPONTE
WITHDRAWAL OF HOLDING OF
ABANDONMENT

A review of the application reveals that a Notice of Abandonment was mailed to the applicant on September 16, 2009. The notice incorrectly indicated that the instant application was being held abandoned "in response to the decision by the Board of Appeals and Interferences (the Board) rendered on June 02, 2009 and because the period for seeking court review of the decision has expired *and there are no allowed claims*". Reference to the Decision on Appeal (page 20 thereof), mailed June 02, 2009, reveals that the Examiner's rejection of pending dependent claims 2, 3 and 16-20 was in fact reversed by the Board.

In accordance with M.P.E.P. § 1214.06(I)(B), the examiner has the following options:

(B) If the Board or court affirms a rejection against an independent claim and reverses all rejections against a claim dependent thereon, ** after expiration of the period for further appeal, >the examiner< should proceed in one of two ways:

- (1) Convert the dependent claim into independent form by examiner's amendment, cancel all claims in which the rejection was affirmed, and issue the application; or
- (2) Set a 1-month time limit in which appellant may rewrite the dependent claim(s) in independent form. Extensions of time under 37 CFR 1.136(a) will not be permitted. If no timely reply is received, the examiner will cancel all rejected and objected to claims and issue the application with the allowed claims only.

In view of these facts, the abandonment of the application was clearly in error and is hereby **VACATED**.

The application is being forwarded to the Supervisory Legal Instruments Examiner with instructions to **WITHDRAW** the holding of abandonment, restore the instant application to pending status. The application will then be forwarded to the Examiner of record for prompt action on the merits, in accordance with this decision. Note, the amendment filed August 3, 2009 is procedural incorrect (see § 1214.06(I)(B)(1) above) and has not been entered.

Inquiries to this decision may be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-3595.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Brian L. Johnson", written over a horizontal line.

Brian L. Johnson
Quality Assurance Specialist, Technology Center 2100
Computer Architecture, Software, and Information Security